

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/925,037	08/09/2001		Hwan-Chul Rho	P56539	2495	
75	590	02/23/2004		EXAMINER		
Robert E. Bushnell				PERRY, ANTHONY T		
Suite 300 1522 K. Street, 3	N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, D		5		2879		
				DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			M					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Aye					
Advisory Action	09/925,037	RHO ET AL.						
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Anthony T Perry	2879						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 16 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment whi al (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	cation. A proper re ich places the appli	ply to a cation in					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]							
· •	The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF								
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:							
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);								
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);								
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or	simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.								
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Some state of the source of the so		sidered but does N	OT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
	Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)								
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to claim 4 changes the range of thickness of the electron emissive material layer and therefor would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Applicant's arguments with respect to the 102(e) rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-6 are not persuasive. The Yamuachi reference states that the range be preferably 10 or less micron. The Applicant still has not provided any unexpected results of the claimed narrower range with comparison to the range disclosed by Yamauchi. The Applicant has given unexpected results when compared to a "conventional cathode" which is taught to be 20 or more microns, however, the cathode of Yamauchi cannot be referred to as a "conventional cathode" since the range is 10 or less. With respect to the argument that the process steps in claims 5 and 6 should be given patentable weight, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant still has not provided teachings to suggest that a differently structured product, as compared with the product disclosed by Yamauchi, is produced.

ATP 2/18/04

VIP PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER